

**Question for written answer E-000132/2026/rev.1
to the Commission**
Rule 144
Yvan Verougstraete (Renew)

Subject: AdTech case – failure to publish the decision and differing treatment of plaintiffs, including Proxistore

The Commission has sent a series of requests for information to publishers, advertisers and intermediaries in order to test the solutions proposed by Google to comply with the judgment establishing a breach of Article 102 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union in the advertising technology sector. This procedure raises a number of questions.

1. The Commission has still not published its full decision, including details of the EUR 2.95 billion fine. The companies consulted are therefore being asked to comment on solutions without having the legal framework, the grounds for the infringement or even the facts of the case enabling them to assess the how appropriate the solutions are. How can a market test possibly be credible under these conditions?
2. Several long-standing plaintiffs, including Proxistore, which has filed repeated complaints since 2018, do not appear to have received any official communication regarding this market test. Can the Commission confirm this difference in treatment and explain the reasons for it?
3. Why is it already seeking feedback on purely behavioural remedies when it has publicly stated that only a structural solution can resolve the conflict of interest at the heart of Google's AdTech model?

The Commission needs to clarify these procedural inconsistencies and guarantee that victims of anti-competitive practices are finally taken into account in a serious and transparent manner.

Submitted: 14.1.2026